

Vaughn, Lorena

From: Nann, Barbara
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2017 2:38 PM
To: Vaughn, Lorena
Subject: FW: AR RH [FOIA Request EPA-R6-2017-008762]

From: Spencer, Stuart [mailto:SPENCER@adeq.state.ar.us]
Sent: Friday, June 02, 2017 11:07 AM
To: Nann, Barbara <nann.barbara@epa.gov>; Spence, Samara (ENRD) <Samara.Spence@usdoj.gov>; jamie.ewing@arkansasag.gov; Montgomery, William <Montgomery@adeq.state.ar.us>; Feldman, Michael <Feldman.Michael@epa.gov>; Donaldson, Guy <Donaldson.Guy@epa.gov>; Medina, Dayana <Medina.Dayana@epa.gov>; Treece, Tricia <treecep@adeq.state.ar.us>; Stenger, Wren <stenger.wren@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: AR RH

Thanks, Barbara.

From: Nann, Barbara [mailto:nann.barbara@epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, June 01, 2017 3:49 PM
To: Spence, Samara (ENRD); jamie.ewing@arkansasag.gov; Montgomery, William; Feldman, Michael; Donaldson, Guy; Medina, Dayana; Spencer, Stuart; Treece, Tricia; Stenger, Wren
Subject: AR RH

Stuart,

I will talk with HQ about national examples of states relying on CSAPR better than BART for EGUs for the RP analysis. I quickly pulled up the case that enviros brought against EPA for approving MN plan that relied on CSAPR better than BART for EGUs as part of their RP analysis. Based on my recollection, this is fairly typical on how EPA has handled that issue. See: <http://www.lawandenvironment.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2016/03/122910P.pdf>.

Barbara